Off with Cleomachus' son, the teacher of tragedy, together with (?) his chorus of depilating female slaves plucking wretched songs ('limbs') in Lydian fashion.

The phrase τιλλουσῶν . . . μέλη is deliberately ambiguous. παρατιλτρίαι were slaves whose unpleasant duty it was to depilate their mistress's body (LSJ, s.v.), and so μέλη τίλλειν can mean 'to pluck limbs (sc. of hair)'. This is not otherwise known as an especially Lydian fashion; Hipponax mentions genital depilation once or twice (frs. 114a, 174 West) and could perhaps be describing Lydian customs, but depilation was also a perfectly good Athenian practice.[24] However, μέλη can also be songs, played on a instrument that one plucks (like a harp), and Λυδιστί more naturally means 'in the (musical) Lydian mode'. This is particularly apt; the (slack) Lydian mode, like the Ionian, was thought especially suitable for symposiastic lyric.[25] Again, the lines suggest lascivious sympotic song, played by groups of hired girls and hetaeras. Davidson (pp. 48–9) speaks of Gnesippus' 'chorus' as if it were a real one, but we would hardly expect to find a proper chorus even in the sort of private lyric mime which he imagines Gnesippus to have written. 'Teacher of tragedy' is an ironic description, and the links with tragic poetry suggested by these two fragments in fact illusory.

Plutarch's account of mimic παίγνια remains a slight oddity, but is clearly unconnected with Gnesippus' lubricious serenades. Possibly παίγνιον in this sense was a term largely restricted to acting circles; Plutarch's καλοῦσιν could be taken to imply as much, though this strikes me as a little unlikely. Precisely why Athenaeus used the term παιγνιαγράφος to describe Gnesippus remains unknown, whether it was taken over from his source or an *ad hoc* coinage based solely on the material he found in the comic fragments. But it does not seem likely from the evidence that he will have thought of it as a precise technical description. Gnesippus' poetry was certainly nothing out of the ordinary, and belonged, whatever individual elements he added himself, to a lyric tradition which went back well into the archaic period.

Highgate, London J. H. HORDERN
jhordern@hotmail.com

[24] For example, Ar. *Eccl.* 60f., *Thesm.* 238, etc.; Henderson on *Lys.* 87–9; Olson on *Pax* 892–3.
[25] Pl. *Rep.* 3.398E; West (n. 7), 179.

POLYAENUS ON IPHICRATES

In the second book of the *Economics* (*Oeconomica*) attributed to Aristotle we read the following about Hippias Peisistratou, tyrant of Athens between 527 and 510:[1]

Hippias the Athenian sold off the parts of balconies which were projecting over the public roads—also the stairways and fences and outward-opening doors; thus the possessions concerned were bought, and in this way substantial sums of money were collected.

Ἱππίας Ἀθηναῖος τὰ ὑπερέχοντα τῶν ὑπερῴων εἰς τὰς δημοσίας ὁδοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀναβαθμοὺς καὶ τὰ προφράγματα καὶ τὰς θύρας τὰς ἀνοιγομένας ἔξω ἐπώλησεν· ὠνοῦντο οὖν ὧν ἦν τὰ κτήματα καὶ συνελέγη χρήματα οὕτω συχνά. ([Arist.] *Oec.* (2) 1347a4–8)

In the third book of the *Stratagems* of Polyaenus, Iphicrates Timotheou of Rham-

[1] All ancient dates are B.C.

nous, one of the most prominent and successful Athenian generals during the first half of the fourth century, is said to have acted as follows:

Iphicrates, when short of money, persuaded the Athenians to cut off or sell the parts of buildings which were projecting over the public roads, so that the masters of the houses contributed large sums of money to prevent the buildings from being hacked about and becoming unsound.

Ἰφικράτης ἐν ἀπορίᾳ χρημάτων ἔπεισεν Ἀθηναίους τὰ ὑπερέχοντα τῶν οἰκοδομημάτων ἐς τὰς δημοσίας ὁδοὺς ἀποκόπτειν ἢ [*καὶ* Rehdantz] *πιπράσκειν, ὥστε οἱ δεσπόται τῶν οἰκιῶν πολλὰ εἰσήνεγκαν χρήματα ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ περικοπῆναι καὶ σαθρὰ γενέσθαι τὰ οἰκοδομήματα.* (Polyaenus, *Strat.* 3.9.30)

Recent studies which cite these two passages—hereinafter referred to as *a* and *b*—appear to accept the historicity of both. Certainly Owens does, in his synoptic survey of ancient city planning.

Legislation was introduced [to curb the constriction of roads] but often proved to be ineffective or inadequate. At Athens, Hippias taxed overhanging balconies, and doors and shutters which opened outwards on to the road. Although this might seem good planning its main purpose was economic. It was a single tax on the property owners and its real importance as a source of revenue for the state is seen when it was re-enacted in the fourth century B.C.[2]

The approach adopted in Schettino's *Introduzione a Polieno* is concerned more with presentation than with fact, but, in those terms, seems to assign both passages the same weight.[3]

We do, of course, have clearcut instances where classical, democratic Athens was prepared to take up an idea first tried out under the Peisistratid tyranny. The most striking of these concerns the *dikastai kata dêmous*: created by the tyrants as circuit-judges on tour throughout Attica (?Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 16.5); subsequently—in 510, on the orthodox assumption—abolished; revived in 453/2 (ibid. 26.3).[4] In the present instance, even so, I am confident that earlier scholars were right to see here a purely historiographical phenomenon, that is, one passage being generated (whether directly or indirectly) by the other.[5] And to my mind there can be little doubt—whatever credence one may choose to give to *a* as purported historical fact—that the interloper is *b*.

The verbal and phraseological correspondences between *a* and *b* would not, perhaps, be sufficient in themselves as proof of an historiographical doublet except to someone who had ruled out *a priori* the possibility that both Hippias and Iphicrates did put forward the schemes attributed to them. If in fact both men did do so, they could not easily have avoided using (or at least being associated with) a phrase like *τὰ ὑπερέχοντα . . . εἰς τὰς δημοσίας ὁδούς*,[6] and similar-sounding ways of describing the

[2] E. J. Owens, *The City in the Greek and Roman World* (London and New York, 1991), 167.

[3] M. T. Schettino, *Introduzione a Polieno* (Pisa, 1999), 217–18, esp. 218: 'Uno stratagemma simile è narrato riguardo ad Ippia da Ps.-ARIST., *Oecon.*, 2, 2, 4, ma in Polieno l'immagine di Ificrate è resa negativa dalla proposta non soltanto di vendere ma anche di demolire gli edifici.' Cf. (non-committal) P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981), 575.

[4] See also 53.1 for the increase in their number (from thirty to forty) and the change in their role at the end of the century.

[5] So e.g. F. Cornelius, *Die Tyrannis in Athen* (Munich, 1929), 56–7; B. A. Van Groningen, *Aristote, Le second livre d'Économique* (Leiden, 1933), 69; and latterly S. P. Arrowsmith, 'The tyranny in Athens in the sixth century B.C.', dissertation (Manchester, 1988), 2.461, n. 73.

[6] For (some) Athenian roads as public property, see generally e.g. Demosthenes 55.13 and 16, with D. M. Lewis, 'Public property in the city', in O. Murray and S. Price (edd.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford 1990), 245–63, at 249.

fiscal rationale behind their plan. Rather, it is the broader context which alerts us to problems with the one passage (*b*) but not the other, and makes it unwise to believe that 'Iphicrates' did what Polyaenus claims he did.

Passage *a* is part of what Lewis called 'a string of stories about Hippias as a deviser of economic stratagems (1347a4–17). These are mostly trivial or anachronistic, though they presumably point to a tradition that Hippias was interested in finance.'[7] In any event, Lewis's 'string' is a short one, consisting as it does of just four items.

By contrast, passage *b* is one of sixty-three stratagems and strategic practices collected by Polyaenus under the name of Iphicrates (3.9). All but three or four of these depict him outside Athens, on active military service.[8] When in the field, Iphicrates, like other generals, sometimes faces (and solves) cashflow problems. The first part of §35 covers this in broad-brush terms:

> If Iphicrates was not in a position to pay his soldiers (εἰ μὲν μὴ ἔχοι διδόναι μισθοφοράν) he led them to uninhabited places and coasts, so that they would spend as little as possible, but if he had plenty of money (εἰ δὲ εὐπορίη χρημάτων) he led them to cities and prosperous places, where they would spend their pay quickly and be eager for some action because they had no silver.

But §59 is more significant, in being an exact parallel to our §30:

> *Iphicrates, when short of money* on an occasion when the soldiers were being rowdy and demanding a general assembly, dressed some men familar with the Persian language in Persian clothes and ordered them to appear once the assembly was filling up; upon arrival they were to announce, in foreign fashion, 'Those who are bringing the money are close by, etc.'
>
> *Ἰφικράτης ἐν ἀπορίᾳ χρημάτων τῶν στρατιωτῶν θορυβούντων καὶ κοινὴν ἐκκλησίαν αἰτουμένων ἄνδρας ἐμπείρους τῆς Περσίδος γλώττης στολὰς Περσικὰς ἐνδυσάμενος προσέταξε πληθούσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιφανῆναι καὶ παρελθόντας ἀγγέλλειν βαρβαριστὶ 'πλησίον οἱ τὰ χρήματα κομίζοντες, κτλ.'*

So far so good. Yet not only in 3.9.59 but also elsewhere, when others are depicted in financial difficulties (e.g. 5.2.19, *Διονύσιος ἐν σπάνει χρημάτων κτλ*; 6.9.1, *Λεύκων χρημάτων δεόμενος κτλ*; 7.32.1, *Σεύθης, ὕπαρχος Κερσοβλέπτου, ἐν σπάνει χρημάτων κτλ*), it is *the named individual himself* who needs the money, and is shown ingeniously getting it.

So is that the case with 3.9.30? Not unless somehow we are to suppose that Iphicrates' proposal, once it was in the form of a motion being voted on by the Athenian Assembly, included a stipulation that the money raised would be for him to spend. It is noteworthy that in the first English translation of Polyaenus—and an admirable one, by and large—since the late eighteenth century, Krentz renders the relevant passage as follows (the emphasis is mine): 'When *the Athenians* were short of money, Iphicrates persuaded them etc.'[9] In this way Krentz seeks to make sense of 3.9.30 in microcosm, but he does so at the expense, it seems, of departing from the Greek, when judged against the background of the parallel passages cited above.[10]

Schettino too appears content to note that 3.9.30 relates 'ai bisogni finanziari della

[7] D. M. Lewis in J. Boardman et al. (edd.), *The Cambridge Ancient History* 4 (Cambridge, 1988²), 290.

[8] The exceptions (besides §30 itself): §§15 and 29 (in court), and probably §16 (family repartee).

[9] *Polyaenus, Stratagems of War*, ed. and tr. P. Krentz ('primarily responsible for [books] 1–6') and E. L. Wheeler, 2 vols (Chicago, 1994), 1.253.

[10] Contrast W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* 2 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974), 102, who retains the connection with Iphicrates himself but assumes, without argument, that the episode has 'to do with the raising of money to provide pay'.

polis',[11] not (directly) to those of Iphicrates himself, without regarding this as anything problematic. On the other hand she does recognize in §§15, 29, and 30 a distinct group of episodes 'tutti collocati in Atene', and indeed, within that group, a similarity of tone as well as content between §15 ('When Iphicrates was the defendant on a capital charge he positioned youths who had hidden daggers; they disclosed the handles to the jurors and thereby alarmed them, with the result that they acquitted him out of fear') and §29 ('When Iphicrates was on trial for treason . . . and saw the jurycourt inclining towards the opposition, he stopped his speech and somehow disclosed his sword to the jurors; afraid that he might arm his comrades *en masse* and surround the jurycourt, they all voted for his acquittal'). 'L'immagine negativa che emerge nei due episodi concernenti il processo non è attestata altrove e conduce a pensare a fonti ostili contemporanee allo stesso Ificrate', is Schettino's (entirely apposite) comment here. 3.9.30 shows no signs of having come from the same hostile source, but, as it stands, is equally out of place within 3.9 as a whole. And that is surely because, at some time before Polyaenus recast it in his preferred formulaic manner (*Ἰφικράτης ἐν ἀπορίᾳ χρημάτων κτλ*), the determining name in the anecdote was not that of Iphikrates but, apparently, Hippias.

Summarizing the duties of the ten Athenian *astynomoi* in the third quarter of the fourth century, ?Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 50.2, writes that they prevent 'the roads being encroached on by buildings and balconies extending over the roads' (*τὰς ὁδοὺς . . . κατοικοδομεῖν καὶ δρυφάκτους ὑπὲρ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑπερτείνειν*). While this in itself can shed no light on whether such concerns had first been addressed under the Peisistratid tyranny, it does reveal that legislation on the subject was in place at the time of writing; and unless it was very recent legislation then—or not carried through into enforcement—there should have been no opportunity for the stratagem that Polyaenus attributes to Iphicrates.[12]

The Queen's University of Belfast DAVID WHITEHEAD
d.whitehead@qub.ac.uk

[11] Schettino (n. 3), 217.

[12] I thank the anonymous *CQ* referee for his/her suggestions, including the advisability of making this final point.

HORACE'S *SATELLES ORCI* (*ODES* 2.18.34)

The impartial earth opens for pauper and princes alike, Horace tells the avaricious addressee of *Odes* 2.18:

> nec satelles Orci
> callidum Promethea
> revexit auro captus. Hic superbum
> Tantalum atque Tantali
> genus coercet, hic levare functum
> pauperem laboribus
> vocatus atque non vocatus audit.

Most editors, reading *revexit* in line 36, say that the *satelles Orci* of line 34 is Charon the ferryman, while a few, reading *revi(n)xit*, which is found in half a dozen manu-